

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

HOLLY RYDMAN, individually and on
behalf of a class of similarly situated
individuals,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHAMPION PETFOODS USA, INC. a
Delaware corporation,
Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:18-cv-01578-JHC

ORDER

I

INTRODUCTION

This matter comes before the Court on the parties' motions in limine (MILs) and the Stipulation and Proposed Order Dismissing Unjust Enrichment Claim. Dkt. ## 159, 160 & 167. Another judge of this District has already ruled on some of the MILs and deferred as to the others. Dkt. # 174. The Court has reviewed the materials filed in support of and in opposition to the MILS, the stipulation, the rest of the case file, oral argument at the pretrial conference earlier today, March 22, 2024, and the governing law. Being fully advised, the Court rules as follows:

/

II

PLAINTIFF’S MILS

- A. The Court GRANTS the portion of Plaintiff’s MIL I that concerns evidence of whether Defendant adhered to any laws or regulations.
- B. With respect to Plaintiff’s MIL II, which concerns evidence that Plaintiff says Defendant did not previously disclose or produce, the Court:
1. GRANTS the MIL as to Exhibit 313;
 2. DENIES the MIL as to Exhibit 314A;
 3. DENIES the MIL as to Exhibit 333; and
 4. Understands a ruling is not needed as to Exhibits 312 and 314B.
- C. The Court VACATES the prior ruling on Plaintiff’s MIL III, which concerns evidence of traceability as to Plaintiff’s purchases. Dkt. # 174. The Court GRANTS Plaintiff’s MIL III.

III

DEFENDANT’S MILS

- A. The Court GRANTS Defendant’s MIL No. 2, which concerns evidence regarding Champion’s overall profits or revenues.
- B. The Court GRANTS Defendant’s MIL No. 3, which concerns evidence regarding heavy metals, pentobarbital, toxins, and contaminants.
- C. The Court GRANTS Defendant’s MIL No. 6, which concerns evidence regarding isolated quality assurance incidents.
- D. The Court GRANTS the portions of Defendant’s MIL No. 8 that concern (1) references to China; and (2) the exhibits referred to in the MIL as PX 077, PX 136, PX 115, and PX 52.

IV

UNJUST ENRICHMENT CLAIM

In the interest of judicial economy, the Court VACATES its order at Dkt. # 182, and DENIES the stipulated motion to dismiss the unjust enrichment claim without prejudice, Dkt. # 167.

V

CONCLUSION

It is so ordered.

Dated this 22nd day of March, 2024.



John H. Chun
United States District Judge